



UNITED STATES PAT.

TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,721	07/18/2003	Gee-Hong Kuo	PRD-19NPUS	2939
27777	7590	12/14/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2005

I&J PAT. DKT. SECTION DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/622,721

**Applicant(s)**

KUO ET AL

**Examiner**

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

**Art Unit**

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, which included amendment to claims 1, 8 and cancellation of claim 6, filed on 9/21/2005, is made of record.

In view of applicants' response, the following apply.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as it is dependent on a rejected claim and shares the same indefiniteness.

1. Recitation of "or pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof" in claims 1 and 8, renders these claims and their dependent claims 2-7 and 9-36 indefinite as it is not clear whether the claim is compound claim or composition claim with above said limitations. Note Markush recitation should be in alternate form and in singular. Recitation of salt in singular is suggested. This rejection is same as made in the previous office action. Applicants have not amended the claims to overcome this rejection.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 8-36 are rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification while being enabling for treating human melanoma and rheumatoid

Art Unit: 1624

arthritis, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating or ameliorating any disorders/diseases, any or all cancer and / or any or all diseases/disorders associated with kinases of growth factor receptors. The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized above.

The instant claims are drawn to "treating or ameliorating a kinase mediated disorder by inhibiting kinases in general and cyclin dependent kinases, glycogen synthase kinase and vascular endothelial growth factor receptor kinase or human epidermal growth factor receptor-3 kinase in specific as well as diseases associated with signal transduction pathways operating through growth factor receptors".. The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer or any or all proliferative diseases due to said kinases inhibition including those yet to be discovered as due said mode of action for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification. The instant compounds are disclosed to have cyclin kinases and kinases of growth factor receptors inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all diseases stated above for which applicants provide no competent evidence. It appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as kinase inhibitor that would be useful for all sorts of proliferative diseases and cancers, any disease which involve signal transduction pathway. However, the applicants have

not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of diseases cancers are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many drugs, which can be used for "specific cancer" or for inflammation.

The scope of the claims involves large number of compounds of claim 1 as well as the thousand of diseases embraced by the terms proliferative disease, cancer, and or the unknown list of "diseases associated with cyclin and receptor kinases

Proliferative disease would include benign tumors, malignant tumors, polyps, lumps, lesions, other pre-cancerous conditions, psoriasis, leukemia, the hyper proliferation of the gastric epithelium caused by the *Helicobacter pylori* infection of ulcers.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

Inflammation is a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There is no common mechanism by which all, or even most, inflammations arise. Mediators include bradykinin, serotonin, C3a, C5a, histamine, leukotrienes, cytokines, and many, many others. Accordingly, treatments for inflammation are normally tailored to the particular type of inflammation present, as there is no, and there can be no "magic bullet" against inflammation generally.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See *Shapiro, Clinical Cancer Research* 10: 4270-4275, 2004

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors

include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating disorders/diseases that require cyclin or growth factor kinase inhibitory activity.

2) The state of the prior art: A very recent publication expressed that the tyrosine kinase inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory. See Shapiro cited above.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all condition of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all condition and the state of the art is that the effects of cyclin kinase inhibitors are unpredictable.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all proliferative diseases and cancers including those yet to be related to cyclin kinase.

Art Unit: 1624

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

This rejection is same as made in the previous office action except that human melanoma is now indicated as enabled but angiogenesis is now considered as not enabled as angiogenesis is not a disease but a mode of action.



Applicants' argument to overcome this rejection is not persuasive for the following reasons.

First of all, instant claims, as recited, are reach through claims. A reach through claim is a claim drawn to a mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality in general format and thereby reach through a scope of invention for which they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification. In the instant case, based on the inhibition of receptor kinases by the instant compounds, claims 8-36 each through treating any of all inflammatory disease in general and thereby they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification. As recited, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various diseases and cancers, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification.

Secondly, contrary to applicants' urging, the need to test in several cell lines is clearly indicative of the fact the enablement in on cell line does not mean objective enablement of any or all cancers. In addition, there are large number of compounds tested in the NCI battery of assays but have not qualified as anti-cancer agents for treating any or all cancers.

Thirdly currently available anti-cancer agents have not found to be useful for treating any or all cancers.

Hence, for the forgoing reasons, the above rejection is maintained.

#### **Conclusion**

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Acting Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0661.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

*Venkataraman Balasubramanian*  
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

12/11/2005